C/F/10030

5

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR, CHHATTISGARH

W.P. No. 618 OF 2001

PETITIONERS

Smt. Sandhya Lingam, W/o Shri Michael Lingam, aged about 38 years, Assistant Grade-II, Tribal Office, Collectorate, Ambikapur, District Sarguja (Chhattisgarh)

Versus

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Tribal Welfare, Mantralaya, D. K. Bhawan Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Collector (Tribal), Sarguja at Ambikapur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Additional Collector and Project Administrator, Integrated Tribal Development Project, Ambikapur, District Sarguja (Chhattisgarh)
4. Assistant Project Administrator, Integrated Tribal Development Project, Ambikapur District Surguja (Chhattisgarh)

P. R. No. 1729/01
Presented by Shri S.R.J. Jaiswal
dated 29-8-01

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC-22

28

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. 1618/01 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	11.9.2001 : Mr.Prashant Mishra for the petitioner. This writ petitioner has been transferred to some other place. The only apprehension of the writ petitioner is that she might become surplus. There is no apprehension as regards pay and allowances and also as regards status. Shri Gautam Bhaduri,learned counsel for the State states that the apprehension of the writ petitioner is not founded. There is no material on record to show that the petitioner shall become surplus. In my view as long as there is security of her employment and as long as she is paid her normal salary and allowance to which she is legally entitled and also as long as her status is protected, the order of transfer as such can not be assailed. According to Mr.Mishra the order of transfer is contrary to the circular issued by the competent authority by which the order of transfer is in fact banned. Shri Bhaduri submits that in the administrative exigency of service the order of transfer has been issued and as such this arrangement can not be interfered with.	

..2

[पीछे देखिये

आदेश पत्रक (पुर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
J	..2.. After considering the averments in the writ petition and also the order of transfer issued on 20.8.2001 and after hearing counsel for both the sides,I am not inclined to interfere with the order of transfer. In the result, in the light of the observations made above this petition is disposed of. Sd/- Chief Justice	